

UNIQUENESS RESULT FOR LONG RANGE SPATIALLY SEGREGATION ELLIPTIC SYSTEM

FARID BOZORGNIA

ABSTRACT. We study a class of elliptic competition-diffusion systems of long range segregation models for two and more competing species. The existence and uniqueness of the solution are shown. We prove that as the competition rate goes to infinity the solution converges, along with suitable sequences, to a spatially long range segregated state satisfying some free boundary problems.

1. Introduction and problem setting

One of the important problems in population ecology is modeling of the interactions between biological components. To achieve this aim, different models based on reaction-diffusion equations are studied. The existence of spatially inhomogeneous solutions for competition models of Lotka-Volterra type with competing densities have been considered in [6, 7]. For spatial segregation, two following models have been studied:

- adjacent segregation: in this model particles interact on contact, and there is a common curve or hyper-surface of separation; free boundary;
- segregation at distance: species interact at a distance from each other.

The adjacent segregation model and strongly competing systems have been extensively studied from different point of views, we will explain briefly these perspective in the coming section, see [3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11]. The model describes the steady state of m competing species coexisting in the same area Ω . Let $u_i(x)$ denote the population density of the i th component with the internal dynamic prescribed by $f_i(x, u_i)$. Then, the interaction between components is described by the following system of m differential equations

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_i^\varepsilon = f_i(x, u_i^\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq i} (u_j^\varepsilon)^\alpha(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i(x) = \phi_i(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ i = 1, \dots, m. \end{cases}$$

Here ϕ_i are non-negative C^1 functions with disjoint supports that is, $\phi_i \cdot \phi_j = 0$, almost everywhere on the boundary. In the system (1.1), the parameter α can be chosen $\alpha = 1$ or 2 which for the case $\alpha = 2$, the system is in variational form.

To explain the second model first, we indicate some of the notations, we are dealing with in this paper.

- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, is bounded convex domain with Lipschitz boundary;
- $d(x, \partial\Omega)$ denotes the distance of the point x to $\partial\Omega$;
- for a given $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $(D)_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : d(x, D) \leq 1\}$;
- $(\partial\Omega)_1 := \{x \in \Omega^c : d(x, \partial\Omega) \leq 1\}$,

Key words and phrases. Spatial Segregation, Reaction- Diffusion systems, Free boundary problems.

F. Bozorgnia was supported by the UT Austin-Portugal partnership through the FCT post-doctoral fellowship SFRH/BPD/33962/2009.

- $\text{supp } f$: the support of function f ;
- $B_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - y| < r\}$;
- $W^+ = \max(W, 0)$ and $W^- = \max(-W, 0)$;
- $\chi_A(x)$: the characteristic function of a given set A .

In this work, we consider the following elliptic system studied in [2]:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i^\varepsilon(x) = \phi_i(x) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) = \int_{B_1(x)} u_j^\varepsilon(y) dy, \quad \text{or} \quad H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) = \sup_{y \in B_1(x)} u_j^\varepsilon(y).$$

Here, the boundary data ϕ_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$ are non-negative, C^1 continuous functions defined on $(\partial\Omega)_1$ with supports at distance, at least, one from each other, i.e.,

$$(\text{supp } \phi_i)_1 \cap (\text{supp } \phi_j)_1 = \emptyset, \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$

System (1.2) can also be viewed as steady state of the following parabolic system

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u_i^\varepsilon}{\partial t} - \Delta u_i^\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) & \text{in } Q := \Omega \times (0, +\infty), \\ u_i^\varepsilon(x, t) = \phi_i(x, t) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_1, \\ u_i^\varepsilon(x, 0) = u_{i,0} & \text{in } \Omega \times \{t = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

The main contribution of this work is to provide the existence (Lemma 3.1) and uniqueness (Lemma 3.2) results for system (1.2) and system (1.3). Furthermore, we show that as the competition rate goes to infinity the solution converges, along with suitable sequences, to a spatially long range segregated state (Lemma 4.6).

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we provide mathematical background and known results about the systems (1.1) and (1.2). Section 3 deals with existence and uniqueness for system (1.2). Section 4 consists analysis of the system in the limiting case as ε tends to zero.

2. Basic facts

In this section we review some of known results and mathematical background for two systems (1.1) and (1.2). The analysis of the system (1.2) is much more difficult compare with system (1.1). Understanding the properties of the system (1.1) gives some insights in the study of system (1.2). Roughly speaking, the system 1.2 can be reduced to the system 1.1) if in the term

$$H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) = \sup_{y \in B_1(x)} u_j^\varepsilon(y),$$

instead of unit ball, we consider the ball with radius r where r tends to zero, then

$$H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) = u_j^\varepsilon(x)$$

so it is possible to see some general behaviour in the system (1.2).

2.1. Known results for the first model

As we already mentioned, the system (1.1) has been studied well. First the existence of solution for each ε is shown in [3, 4] i.e, for each ε the system (1.1) admits a solution $(u_1^\varepsilon, \dots, u_m^\varepsilon) \in (H^1(\Omega))^m$. Moreover, it is also shown that for each ε the normal derivative of u_i^ε is bounded independent of ε which implies that there exists $(u_1, \dots, u_m) \in (H^1(\Omega))^m$ such that up to subsequences, we have the strong convergence of u_i^ε to u_i in $H^1(\Omega)$, and $u_i \cdot u_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$. Uniqueness of elliptic system

(1.1) and parabolic system have been shown in [14]. In [5] for a class of segregation state governed by a variational principle, existence of solutions is shown and also the conditions that provide the uniqueness are given. The long time dynamics for a two components competing and diffusing system with inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition is given in [6, 7, 8, 13]. To see numerical approximation of the system (1.1) for the case that ε tends to zero, see [1].

Another observed result in [3], is that for points on the interface separating the support of u_i and u_j the following holds

$$\lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ u_i(y) > 0}} \nabla u_i(y) = - \lim_{\substack{y \rightarrow x \\ u_j(y) > 0}} \nabla u_j(y).$$

The limiting solutions of (1.1) share the following properties and belong to class S in below, [3]

$$S = \left\{ U = (u_1, \dots, u_m) \in H^1(\Omega) : u_i \geq 0, u_i \cdot u_j = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j, \right. \\ \left. u_i = \phi_i \text{ on } \partial\Omega, -\Delta u_i \leq 0, -\Delta \left(u_i - \sum_{j \neq i} u_j \right) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Now consider the energy associated to m densities which is defined by

$$E(U) = \int_{\Omega} \sum_i |\nabla u_i(x)|^2 dx.$$

It is shown in [5] that for the case $m = 3$ the following problem

$$\min \{ E(U) : u_i \in H^1(\Omega), u_i \geq 0, u_i \cdot u_j = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j, u_i|_{\partial\Omega} = \phi_i \}$$

admits a unique solution. Furthermore, the limiting configuration for system (1.1) minimizes the energy associated to the system.

Remark 1. In system (1.1) when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the system in variational form, i.e., $\alpha = 2$ has same solution as the system with $\alpha = 1$.

In the case of two components i.e., $m = 2$ the explicit solution can be obtained as following. Note that in this case the difference of two functions, $u_1^\varepsilon - u_2^\varepsilon$, is harmonic for each ε , compare with (1.24) in subsection 4.1. Let W be the harmonic extension on Ω of the boundary data $\phi_1 - \phi_2$. If we set $u_1 = W^+$, $u_2 = W^-$, then the pair (u_1, u_2) is the limit configuration of any sequences of pairs $(u_1^\varepsilon, u_2^\varepsilon)$, and there exists $C \geq 0$ such that, (see [3])

$$\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1/6} \cdot \|u_i^\varepsilon - u_i\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Recently in [10], the regularity issues for system of strongly competing Schrödinger equation with nontrivial grouping has been studied. The $C^{0,\alpha}$ estimate that are uniform in competition parameter, also the regularity of free boundary as competition rate tends to infinity, are obtained, we refer to [12] for more related work.

Regularity of the nodal set of segregated critical configurations for a class of Lipschitz vector functions which its components are nonnegative, disjointly supported and verify an elliptic equation on each support been studied in [9]. The authors prove that the nodal set is a collection of $C^{1,\alpha}$ hyper-surfaces. They applied the result to the asymptotic limits of reaction-diffusion systems with strong competition interactions, to optimal partition problems involving eigenvalue.

2.2. Long range segregated model

Now, we turn our attention to the second system given by (1.2). System (1.2) is in variational form if

$$H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) = \int_{B_1(x)} (u_j^\varepsilon(y))^2 dy.$$

Remark 2. In system (1.1), the interaction between components is given by the term $u_i(x)u_j(x)$; while in (1.2) components interacting by the nonlocal term $u_i^\varepsilon H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x)$. The analysis and asymptotic behaviour of the system (1.1) are more straightforward than system (1.2). For instance, if the number of components $m = 2$, then in system (1.1), the difference $u_1^\varepsilon - u_2^\varepsilon$ is harmonic for each ε while this is not true for system (1.2).

In [2] rigorous analysis is done to show the following :

- There exist continuous functions $u_1^\varepsilon, \dots, u_m^\varepsilon$ depending on the parameter ε which solve the system (1.2) in viscosity sense.
- As ε tends to zero, there exists a subsequence $u_i^{\varepsilon_k}$ converging locally uniformly, to a function u_i , satisfying the properties that the u_i 's are Lipschitz continuous in Ω and have supports at distance at least from each other.
- Each function u_i is harmonic on its support. The authors show the semi convexity of the free boundary. For the points belong to free boundary, there is an exterior tangent ball of radius one at x_0 .
- The free boundary set has finite $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.
- They obtained sharp characterization of the interfaces, i.e, the supports of the limit functions are at distance exactly one from each other.

3. Existence and uniqueness of the nonlocal segregation model

Consider the following elliptic system

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^\varepsilon \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^\varepsilon)(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i(x) = \phi_i(x) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_1. \end{cases}$$

Existence of the solution for system (1.4) has been shown in [2] by Schauder fixed point argument. The aim of this work to cover the lack of uniqueness for solution of (1.4). We tackle the problem inspiring from the idea used to prove the uniqueness of system (1.1) given in [14]. Since the proof is constructive it can be used for numerical simulation to approximate the solution of ε problem in (1.4).

Lemma 3.1. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a unique positive solution $(u_1^\varepsilon, \dots, u_m^\varepsilon)$ of System (1.4).*

Proof. To start, consider the harmonic extension u_i^0 given by

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_i^0 = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i^0 = \phi_i & \text{on } (\Omega)_1 \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Now, given u_i^k consider the solution of the following linear system

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i^{k+1} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^{k+1} \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^k)(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i^{k+1}(x) = \phi_i(x) & \text{on } (\Omega)_1 \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We show that the following inequalities hold:

$$u_i^0 \geq u_i^2 \geq \dots \geq u_i^{2k} \geq \dots \geq u_i^{2k+1} \geq \dots \geq u_i^3 \geq u_i^1, \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Note that since $u_i^0 \geq 0$ then

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} u_j^0(y) dy \geq 0, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

The boundary conditions $\phi_i(x)$ are non negative so the weak maximum principle (see appendix) implies that $u_i^1 \geq 0$ and consequently

$$u_i^k \geq 0, \quad \text{for } k \geq 1, i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Now we have

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i^1 \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_i^1(x) = u_i^0(x) = \phi_i(x) & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Thus the comparison principle implies that $u_i^1 \leq u_i^0$. To proceed more with induction, assume that

$$(1.8) \quad u_i^0 \geq u_i^2 \geq \dots \geq u_i^{2k} \geq u_i^{2k+1} \geq \dots \geq u_i^3 \geq u_i^1.$$

We show that

$$(1.9) \quad u_i^{2k+2} \geq u_i^{2k+1}.$$

By (1.6) and the assumption in (1.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u_i^{2k+2} &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^{2k+2} \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^{2k})(x), \\ \Delta u_i^{2k+1} &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^{2k+1} \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^{2k})(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that u_i^{2k+1} and u_i^{2k+2} have the same boundary value so (1.9) follows from the comparison principle.

The same argument using the assumption $u_i^{2k+1} \geq u_i^{2k-1}$ shows that

$$u_i^{2k+2} \leq u_i^{2k}.$$

For the next step, we note that

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u_i^{2k+3} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^{2k+3} \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^{2k+2})(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta u_i^{2k+1} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} u_i^{2k+1} \sum_{j \neq i} H(u_j^{2k})(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

From previous step we have $u_i^{2k+2} \leq u_i^{2k}$ which implies

$$u_i^{2k+3} \geq u_i^{2k+1}.$$

Now let $\bar{u}_i$ and $\underline{u}_i$ be two families of functions such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^{2k} &\rightarrow \bar{u}_i \quad \text{uniformly in } \Omega, \\ u_i^{2k+1} &\rightarrow \underline{u}_i \quad \text{uniformly in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit in (1.6) yields

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta \bar{u}_i = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bar{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\underline{u}_j)(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta \underline{u}_i = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \underline{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\bar{u}_j)(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The inequality $u_i^{2k+1} \leq u_i^{2k}$ implies that

$$(1.12) \quad \bar{u}_i \geq \underline{u}_i \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

We will show that, in fact, the equality holds. Since $\bar{u}_i = \underline{u}_i$ on $\partial\Omega$, by (1.12), we have

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial n} \leq \frac{\partial \underline{u}_i}{\partial n},$$

where n is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Hence

$$(1.14) \quad \int_{\Omega} \sum_i \Delta \bar{u}_i(x) dx = \int_{\partial\Omega} \sum_i \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial n} ds \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} \sum_i \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial n} ds = \int_{\Omega} \sum_i \Delta \underline{u}_i(x) dx.$$

Substituting equation (1.11) into (1.14), we obtain

$$(1.15) \quad \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i,j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \left(\int_{B_1(x)} \underline{u}_j(y) dy \right) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \left(\int_{B_1(x)} \bar{u}_j(y) dy \right) dx.$$

Rewriting this, we get a symmetric kernel $K(x, y)$; such that

$$(1.16) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \underline{u}_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \bar{u}_i(y) K(x, y) dy dx,$$

where $K(x, y)$ is $\chi_{B_1(0)}(x - y)$ with $\chi_{B_1(0)}$ the characteristic function of the unit ball centered at the origin. Since K is symmetric in x and y ,

$$(1.17) \quad \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \underline{u}_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \bar{u}_i(y) K(x, y) dy dx.$$

The remaining part is

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \underline{u}_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \phi_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx \\ & \geq \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \phi_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \bar{u}_i(y) K(x, y) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (1.16)-(1.18) we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{u}_i(x) \phi_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega} \sum_{j \neq i} \underline{u}_j(x) \phi_j(y) K(x, y) dy dx.$$

This then implies that

$$\bar{u}_i \equiv \underline{u}_i, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

which is a solution of (1.4). $\square$

Lemma 3.2. (Uniqueness) Assume there exists another solution $(w_1, \dots, w_n)$ of (1.2), then

$$u_i = w_i.$$

Proof. We will prove that the following hold:

$$(1.19) \quad u_i^{2m+1} \leq w_i \leq u_i^{2m}, \quad \text{for } m \geq 0.$$

To begin, we show that

$$(1.20) \quad w_i \leq u_i^0.$$

This is a consequence of the fact that w_i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_i \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_i = u_i^0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Next we compare w_i with u_i^1 and we show $w_i \geq u_i^1$. This inequality follows from (1.20) and

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_i = \frac{w_i}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} w_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta u_i^1 = \frac{u_i^1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} u_j^0 & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Now we proceed by induction and we assume that the claim is true until $2m + 1$. This means that we have

$$u_i^{2m+1} \leq w_i \leq u_i^{2m}.$$

Then we show

$$u_i^{2m+3} \leq w_i \leq u_i^{2m+2}.$$

Again we can compare the equations in below

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_i = \frac{w_i}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} w_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta u_i^{2m+2} = \frac{u_i^{2m+2}}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} u_j^{2m+1} & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Here we use that $u_j^{2m+1} \leq w_j$ which implies that $w_i \leq u_i^{2m+2}$. Also we have

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w_i = \frac{w_i}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} w_j & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta u_i^{2m+3} = \frac{u_i^{2m+2}}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j \neq i} \int_{B_1(x)} u_j^{2m+2} & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the last step $u_i^{2m+2} \geq w_i$, which implies

$$u_i^{2m+3} \leq w_i.$$

Now taking limit in (1.19) shows that

$$w_i = u_i. \quad \square$$

The same method can be used to construct the unique solution to the parabolic problem (1.3). Indeed, we can proceed as before to construct functions $\bar{u}_i \geq \underline{u}_i$, which satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \bar{u}_i - \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bar{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\underline{u}_j)(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta \underline{u}_i - \frac{\partial \underline{u}_i}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \underline{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\bar{u}_j)(x) & \text{in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we still have

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial n} \leq \frac{\partial \underline{u}_i}{\partial n}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Hence for any $T > 0$,

$$\int_0^T \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial n} \leq \int_0^T \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial \underline{u}_i}{\partial n}.$$

Substituting the equation into this, the left hand side equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bar{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\underline{u}_j) \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bar{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\underline{u}_j) + \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}_i(x, T) dx - \int_{\Omega} u_{i,0}(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

and a similar one holds for the right hand side. By noting that

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{u}_i(x, T) dx \geq \int_{\Omega} \underline{u}_i(x, T) dx,$$

we obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \bar{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\underline{u}_j) \leq \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \underline{u}_i \sum_{j \neq i} H(\bar{u}_j).$$

The rest of the proof is exactly the same as before.

4. Basic estimates and asymptotic behavior as ε tends to zero

In this part we study the elliptic systems with highly competitive interaction term. We provide the estimates for the case that competition rate tends to infinity which yields the long range distance of positive components.

For simplicity, we assume that the number of components is $m = 2$ and we consider the following system

$$(1.21) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u^\varepsilon = f(u^\varepsilon) - \frac{u^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \int_{B_1(x)} v^\varepsilon(y) dy & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta v^\varepsilon = g(v^\varepsilon) - \frac{v^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \int_{B_1(x)} u^\varepsilon(y) dy & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x) = \phi(x) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_1, \\ v(x) = \varphi(x) & \text{on } (\partial\Omega)_1. \end{cases}$$

Here we assume that $f, g \in C^1[0, \infty)$ such that $f(0) = g(0) = 0$ and for all $s > 1$ we have $f(s) < 0, g(s) < 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let u^ε and v^ε be the solution of system (1.21). Then*

$$0 \leq u^\varepsilon(x) \leq \max\{1, \max \phi\}, \quad 0 \leq v^\varepsilon(x) \leq \max\{1, \max \varphi\}.$$

Proof. Positivity of u^ε and v^ε follows from the facts that the function 0 satisfies the equations in (1.21) and u, v are positive on the boundary.

To show the inequalities $u^\varepsilon \leq \max\{1, \max \phi\}$ and $v^\varepsilon \leq \max\{1, \max \varphi\}$ the proof is done by contradiction. Assume the maximum of u^ε is attained at an $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $u^\varepsilon(x_0) > 1$. Then positivity of u^ε and v^ε in the first equation of (1.21) shows:

$$\Delta u^\varepsilon(x_0) \geq -f(u^\varepsilon(x_0)).$$

The assumptions of f implies that $f(u^\varepsilon(x_0)) < 0$ which yields $\Delta u^\varepsilon(x_0) > 0$, which is impossible. $\square$

We use the next Lemma in [2] which states in a strip of size one around the support of a component on the boundary the other components decays to zero exponentially.

Lemma 4.2. *For $\sigma > 0$, let*

$$\bar{\Gamma}^\sigma := \{\phi(x) > \sigma\} \subset \Omega^c.$$

Then on the set $\{x \in \Omega : d(x, \bar{\Gamma}^\sigma) \leq 1 - r\}$, $0 < r < 1$, we have

$$u^\varepsilon \leq C e^{\frac{-c\sigma^\alpha r^\beta}{\varepsilon}}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ be a solution of (1.21) with $f = g = 0$. There exists a positive constant C_2 independent of ε such that*

$$\sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon(x)}{\partial n} \right| \leq C_2,$$

$$\sup_{x \in \partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial v^\varepsilon(x)}{\partial n} \right| \leq C_2,$$

where n denotes exterior normal to $\partial\Omega$.

Proof. We construct barrier functions to control the bound of gradient of u^ε and v^ε as follows. Firstly, the following inequalities hold

$$-\Delta u^\varepsilon \leq 0, \quad -\Delta v^\varepsilon \leq 0.$$

By the standard sup-sub solution method, we can construct solutions $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \bar{u} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta \bar{v} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \bar{u} = \phi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ \bar{v} = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$u^\varepsilon \leq \bar{u}, \quad v^\varepsilon \leq \bar{v}.$$

Hence

$$(1.22) \quad \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial n} \geq \frac{\partial \bar{u}}{\partial n}, \quad \frac{\partial v^\varepsilon}{\partial n} \geq \frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial n}.$$

Note that such $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ are independent of ε . At the part where $\phi = 0$, because $u \geq 0$ in Ω , we also have

$$\frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial n} \leq 0.$$

Combined with (1.22), we get a uniform bound on $\frac{\partial u}{\partial n}$. It remains to consider the case on $\{\phi > 0\}$. Take an $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\phi(x_0) > 0$. By the previous lemma,

$$v^\varepsilon(x) \leq C e^{-\frac{1}{C\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0),$$

where C depends on $\phi(x_0)$. Then in $\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)$, u^ε satisfies

$$-\Delta u^\varepsilon \geq -\frac{C}{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{1}{C\varepsilon}} u^\varepsilon.$$

From this we can construct a solution u_ε to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_\varepsilon = -\frac{C}{\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{1}{C\varepsilon}} u_\varepsilon & \text{in } \Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0), \\ u^\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon & \text{on } \partial(\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0)). \end{cases}$$

Moreover,

$$u^\varepsilon \geq u_\varepsilon, \quad \text{in } \Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0).$$

Hence

$$\frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \leq \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu}, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0).$$

By standard boundary gradient estimates, there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε , such that

$$\frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \leq C, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \cap B_{\frac{1}{2}}(x_0).$$

Take a finite cover of $\partial\Omega \cap \{\phi > 0\}$ using balls $B_{\frac{1}{4}}(x_i)$ with $x_i \in \partial\Omega \cap \{\phi > 0\}$, we see

$$\frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \leq C, \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega \cap \{\phi > 0\}.$$

Combining this with (1.22) we get a uniform bound on $\frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial \nu}$ in the part $\partial\Omega \cap \{\phi > 0\}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *There exist a constant C independent of ε such that if $(u^\varepsilon, v^\varepsilon)$ is a solution of system (1.21) then*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_{B_1(x)} v^\varepsilon(y) dy \right) dx &\leq C, \\ \int_{\Omega} \frac{v^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_{B_1(x)} u^\varepsilon(y) dy \right) dx &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By integrating of the first equation in (1.21) over Ω , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{u^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \left(\int_{B_1(x)} v^\varepsilon(y) dy \right) dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} \Delta u^\varepsilon + f(u^\varepsilon) dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial n} ds + \int_{\Omega} f(u^\varepsilon) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3 give the result. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a positive constant C_2 independent of ε such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 dx &\leq C_2, \\ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v^\varepsilon|^2 dx &\leq C_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We multiply the first equation in (1.21) by u^ε and integration over Ω gives

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u^\varepsilon|^2 dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} u^\varepsilon \frac{\partial u^\varepsilon}{\partial n} ds \leq \int_{\Omega} u^\varepsilon f(u^\varepsilon) dx.$$

Now the boundedness on u^ε and Lemma 4.3 give the result. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let u and v be the limiting solution of (1.21). Assume that x_0 be a point in Ω such that $u(x_0) > 0$. Then we have*

$$v \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } B_1(x_0).$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\int_{\Omega} u^\varepsilon(x_0) \left(\int_{B_1(x_0)} v^\varepsilon(y) dy \right) dx \leq C\varepsilon,$$

Let ε tends to zero in the above inequality to get

$$0 \leq \int_{\Omega} u(x_0) \left(\int_{B_1(x_0)} v(y) dy \right) dx \leq 0.$$

This implies

$$\int_{\Omega} u(x_0) \left(\int_{B_1(x_0)} v(y) dy \right) dx = 0,$$

which shows

$$v \equiv 0 \quad \text{in } B_1(x_0). \quad \square$$

Remark 3. Let u and v be the limiting solution of (1.21) as ε tends to zero. Lemma (4.6) shows that the support of u and the support of v have disjoint at distance at least one. In fact in [2] it is shown that u and v are exactly at distance one.

Definition 4.7. The boundaries $\partial\{x \in \Omega : u(x) > 0\}$, $\partial\{x \in \Omega : v(x) > 0\}$ are called free boundaries.

Lemma 4.6 states that

$$u \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } (\text{supp } v)_1; \quad \Delta u = 0 \quad \text{in } \{u > 0\}.$$

4.1. Free boundary condition in dimension one

Let $d = 1$ and $\Omega = (-a, a)$. Consider the following system

$$(1.23) \quad \begin{cases} (u^\varepsilon(x))'' = \frac{u^\varepsilon(x)}{\varepsilon} \sup_{y \in [x-1, x+1]} v^\varepsilon(y) & \text{in } (-a, a), \\ (v^\varepsilon(x))'' = \frac{v^\varepsilon(x)}{\varepsilon} \sup_{y \in B_1(x)} u^\varepsilon(y) & \text{in } (-a, a), \\ u(x) = \phi(x) & \text{on } (-a-1, -a), \\ v(x) = \varphi(x) & \text{on } (a, a+1). \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\sup_{y \in [x-1, x+1]} v^\varepsilon(y) = v^\varepsilon(x+1).$$

Also we have that

$$(v^\varepsilon(x+1))'' = \frac{v^\varepsilon(x+1)}{\varepsilon} \sup_{y \in [x, x+2]} u^\varepsilon(y) = \frac{v^\varepsilon(x+1)}{\varepsilon} u^\varepsilon(x).$$

This shows for every ε

$$(1.24) \quad (u^\varepsilon(x) - v^\varepsilon(x+1))'' = 0.$$

Let u, v be the limiting points as ε tends to zero. Then u and v satisfy the following system

$$(1.25) \quad \begin{cases} -(u(x) - v(x+1))'' = 0 & \text{in } (-a, a), \\ -(v(x) - u(x-1))'' = 0 & \text{in } (-a, a), \\ u(-a) = \phi(-a) \quad v(a) = \varphi(a), \\ u, v \geq 0 & \text{in } (-a, a). \end{cases}$$

This shows that in (1.25) if x_f be a free boundary point then

$$u'(x_f) = -v'(x_f + 1).$$

5. Conclusion and further works

The existence and uniqueness of the solution for a class of elliptic competition-diffusion systems of long range segregation models are shown.

In a forthcoming paper the author will present numerical approximation for the class of elliptic and parabolic competition-diffusion systems of long range segregation models for two and more competing species.

Acknowledgments

The author has great thanks to Prof. Caffarelli for suggesting problem and also would like to thank to Kelei. Wang for helpful suggestions and discussion.

6. Appendix

Weak Maximum principle: Consider elliptic operator L having non divergence form

$$Lu = - \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} u_{x_i x_j} + \sum_i^n b_i u_{x_i} + cu,$$

where the coefficients a_{ij}, b_i, c are continuous. Assume $u \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $c \geq 0$ in Ω .

- If

$$Lu \leq 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$
 then

$$\max_{\overline{\Omega}} u \leq \max_{\partial\Omega} u^+$$
- Likewise, if

$$Lu \geq 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$
 then

$$\min_{\overline{\Omega}} u \leq \min_{\partial\Omega} u^-$$

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bozorgnia, *Numerical algorithms for the spatial segregation of competitive systems*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput, No. 5, 3946-3958, (2009).
- [2] L. Caffarelli, S. Patrizi and V. Quitalo, *A nonlocal segregation model*, preprint.
- [3] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini, *Asymptotic estimate for spatial segregation of competitive systems*, Advances in Mathematics. **195**, 524-560, (2005).
- [4] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini, *A variational problem for the spatial segregation of reaction-diffusion systems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **54**, no 3, 779-815, (2005).
- [5] M. Conti, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini, *Uniqueness and least energy property for solution of strongly competing systems*, Interface and Free Boundaries. **8**, 437-446, (2006).
- [6] E.N. Dancer, Y.H. Du, *Competing species equations with diffusion, large interactions, and jumping nonlinearities*, J. Differential Equations. **114**, 434-475, (1994).
- [7] E.N. Dancer, D. Hilhorst, M. Mimura, and L.A. Peletier, *Spatial segregation limit of a competition diffusion system*, European J. Appl. Math. **10**, 97-115, (1999).
- [8] E.N. Dancer, *Competing species systems with diffusion and large interaction*, Rend. Sem. Mat.Fis. Milano. **65**, 23-33, (1995).
- [9] H. Tavares, S. Terracini, *Regularity of the nodal set of segregated critical configurations under a weak reflection law*, Calc. Var. **45**, 273-317, (2012).
- [10] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, and G. Verzini, *Uniform Hölder Bounds for Nonlinear Schrödinger Systems with Strong Competition*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, **63**, 267-302, (2010).
- [11] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, G. Verzini, *Convergence of minimax structures and continuation of critical points for singularly perturbed systems* J. Eur. Math. Soc. **14**, 1245-1273, (2012).
- [12] N. Soavea, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, A. Zilio, *Hölder bounds and regularity of emerging free boundaries for strongly competing Schrödinger equations with nontrivial grouping*, To appear in Nonlinear Analysis.
- [13] S.-I. Ei, E. Yanagida, *Dynamics of interfaces in competition-diffusion systems*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **54**, 1355-1373, (1994).
- [14] K. Wang, Z. Zhang, *Some new results in competing systems with many species*, Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN, **27**, 739-761, (2010).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, LISBON.
 E-mail address: bozorg@math.ist.utl.pt